

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

RICHARD FARREN,	:	CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
RJM ACQUISITIONS FUNDING LLC,	:	
Defendant	:	NO. 04-995

O R D E R

Gene E.K. Pratter, J.

September 1, 2005

AND NOW, this 1st day of September, 2005, upon consideration of Defendant RJM Acquisitions Funding LLC's Motion for Reconsideration (Docket No. 59) and the responses thereto, it is hereby ORDERED that the Motion is DENIED.¹

BY THE COURT:

GENE E.K. PRATTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence. Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 476 U.S. 1171 (1986). A court should grant a motion for reconsideration “only if the moving party establishes one of three grounds: (1) there is newly available evidence; (2) an intervening change in the controlling law; or (3) there is a need to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” Drake v. Steamfitters Local Union No. 420, No. 97-585, 1998 WL 564486, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 3, 1998) (citing Smith v. City of Chester, 155 F.R.D. 95, 96-97 (E.D. Pa. 1994)). “Because federal courts have a strong interest in finality of judgments, motions for reconsideration should be granted sparingly.” Continental Casualty Co. v. Diversified Industries, Inc., 884 F. Supp. 937, 943 (E.D. Pa. 1995). The moving party must show more than mere disappointment with the Court’s ruling for reconsideration to be granted. Burger King Corp. v. New England Hood and Duct Cleaning Co., 2000 WL 133756, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 4, 2000); Glendon Energy Co. v. Borough of Glendon, 836 F.Supp. 1109, 1122 (E.D.Pa.1993). In this case, the Court does not find that Defendant RJM Acquisition Fundings has satisfied the requirements for the Court to grant a motion for reconsideration.